UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,594	12/03/2004	Kristofer Skantze	09059.0035-00000	8557

22852 7590 07/07/2010

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER	
JOSEPH, DENNIS P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/07/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/516,594	SKANTZE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DENNIS P. JOSEPH	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 March 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 20-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17 and 20-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 December 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/11/2010*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to amendments filed for application No. 10/516,594 on March 8, 2010. Claims 1-17 and 20-53 are pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on June 11, 2010 was filed. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. **Claims 1, 23, 30, 33, 34, 41, 45 and 51** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites therein that the position data "represents a plurality of optically-detectable marks."

However, there is no support for the added limitations. Applicant provided a location in the specification for support, but respectfully, this does not have this level of detail. It seems to examiner that the specification provides for digital and electrical detection (by pens) of the touch location, but not by an optical means. Please provide more clarification, thank you. Similar issues exist in the above noted claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-16, 18-21, 23, 24, 26-38, 40-45, and 47-**53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson J et al. (International Pub# WO 01/48678 A1) in view of Russell et al. (US 6,703,570 B1)

For **claim 1,** Andersson teaches an information processing system comprising (Andersson, abstract): a storage unit with a first interface for receiving data and storing graphical objects (Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient unit, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor), the graphical objects being characterized by graphic information (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-12), and a second interface for reading the stored graphical objects (Andersson, page 4, lines 27-36);

Andersson does not teach an allocation unit and the related elements; however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches an allocation unit configured to assign on command, from a position data bank, position data for a current graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26), and to provide allocation data which associates said assigned position data with the current graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Here Russell teaches a base with a bar code reader that can assign position data for the current form (i.e. graphical object) and provide the allocation data for the current form. This can also be from a virtual copy of the form stored in the base; Russell also teaches wherein the second interface of the storage unit is configured to allow selection of the current graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26) (from the barcode reader), wherein the allocation unit is commanded to assign the position data in response to a selection of the current graphical object, and wherein the allocation unit provides said assigned position data to a combining module for application of graphic information corresponding to the current graphical object and said assigned position data to a substrate for forming a printed coded base (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Please note that both Andersson (Figures 10 and 12, for example. Many parts of his disclosure, such as the description of these figures, note of optically readable patterns, i.e. optical parameters) and Russell (Column 8, Lines 1-26 disclose optical marks on a substrate that encode digital information) teach of optically-detectable marks. Please note the combination that teaches to use the base, such as Andersson's structure, with Russell; there is a suggestion in both references of using such a known technique. Here Russell teaches the base is commanded to assign position data when it is made to read a bar code from the selected form and applies the data to the base (i.e. substrate). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson with Russell because

both deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Russell would increase the usability of the device by allowing the base to use many forms.

For **claim 2,** Andersson teaches comprising a directing unit which is designed to direct, on the basis of said allocation data, said position data from a digital unit to a current processing unit among a plurality of processing units in the system, the processing units being configured to receive, from the digital unit, said position data and process said position data according to predetermined rules (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33).

For **claim 3,** Andersson teaches the allocation data comprises an address identifier which is associated with a network address of a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33).

For **claims 4, 7, 8, 9, 26,** Andersson teaches the directing unit to receive position data, identify address identifier for the current processing unit, and sending address identifier to the digital unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33).

For **claim 5,** Andersson teaches transferring address identifier (Andersson, page 14, lines 20-33).

For **Claim 6,** Andersson teaches each graphical object is associated with a respective address identifier in the storage unit, and wherein the storage unit is adapted to transfer to said allocation unit said address identifier for a processing unit, the processing unit being configured

to receive, from a digital unit, said position data and process said position data according to a predetermined rule (Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24; page 14, lines 24-33).

For **claims 10, 12, 15, 24, 27, 28, 29, 40,** Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30).

For **claim 11,** Andersson teaches comprising a current processing unit that receives detected position data from a digital unit, identifies an assigned rule object on the basis of said object identifier, and processes said position data according to the assigned rule object (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-14, abstract).

For **claims 13, 14,** Andersson teaches wherein all object identifiers are stored in the storage unit (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-6; page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the selection of the graphical object would only be allowed if the object identifier of the graphical object matched an object identifier in the system. If it did not match the system would not know how to process that information.

For **claim 16**, Andersson teaches the object identifier computable based on the graphical image (Andersson, page 27, lines 26-34).

For **claims 18, 20, 21,** Andersson does not teach a generating the coded base, however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches printing graphic information and position data (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). It is well known in the art that an image file is graphic information and in order to print an image file, it would be converted to a print file format.

For **claim 19,** Andersson teaches a digital unit that is designed to detect position data on a coded base (Andersson, figure 1, item 1). The coded base partly being generated from a graphical object (Andersson, figure 1) with at least one processing unit designed to receive data (Andersson, page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient unit, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor). Andersson also teaches a storage unit for receiving and storing data (Andersson, page 4, lines 27-30) and a second interface for exposing and reading data (Andersson, page 14, lines 23-28 and lines 34-37).

For **claim 23,** Andersson teaches a digital unit that is designed to detect position data on a coded base (Andersson, figure 1, item 1). The coded base partly being generated from a graphical object (Andersson, figure 1). With a plurality of processing units designed to receive data (Andersson, page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient units, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor). Andersson teaches a directing unit to direct the position data to a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33).

Andersson does not teach an allocation unit; however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches an allocation unit configured to assign on command in response to a selection of a current graphical object characterized by user-readable graphic information configured for

application to a substrate, position data for the current graphical object from a position data bank, and provides allocation data which associates said assigned position data with the current graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Here Russell teaches a base with a bar code reader that can assign position data for the current form (i.e. graphical object) and provide the allocation data for the current form. This can also be from a virtual copy of the form stored in the base. Please note that both Andersson (Figures 10 and 12, for example. Many parts of his disclosure, such as the description of these figures, note of optically readable patterns, i.e. optical parameters) and Russell (Column 8, Lines 1-26 disclose optical marks on a substrate that encode digital information) teach of optically-detectable marks. Please note the combination that teaches to use the base, such as Andersson's structure, with Russell; there is a suggestion in both references of using such a known technique. Russell also teaches a combining module for application of the user-readable graphic information corresponding to the current graphical object and said assigned position data to a substrate for forming a coded base (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Here Russell teaches the base is commanded to assign position data when it is made to read a bar code from the selected form and applies the data to the base (i.e. substrate). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson with Russell because both deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Russell would increase the usability of the device by allowing the base to use many forms.

For **claim 30**, Andersson teaches a processing unit configured to receive detected position data from a digital unit (Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient unit, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor),

obtain the rule object upon receipt of the detected position data, and process said detected position data according to the rule object Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28).

Andersson does not teach an allocation unit; however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches an allocation unit configured to assign on command in response to a selection of a current graphical object characterized by user-readable graphic information configured for application to a substrate, position data for the current graphical object from a position data bank, and provides allocation data which associates said assigned position data with the current graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Here Russell teaches a base with a bar code reader that can assign position data for the current form (i.e. graphical object) and provide the allocation data for the current form. This can also be from a virtual copy of the form stored in the base. Please note that both Andersson (Figures 10 and 12, for example. Many parts of his disclosure, such as the description of these figures, note of optically readable patterns, i.e. optical parameters) and Russell (Column 8, Lines 1-26 disclose optical marks on a substrate that encode digital information) teach of optically-detectable marks. Please note the combination that teaches to use the base, such as Andersson's structure, with Russell; there is a suggestion in both references of using such a known technique. Russell also teaches a combining module for application of the user-readable graphic information corresponding to the current graphical object and said assigned position data to a substrate for forming a printed coded base (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Here Russell teaches the base is commanded to assign position data when it is made to read a bar code from the selected form and applies the data to the base (i.e. substrate). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Andersson with Russell because both deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Russell would increase the usability of the device by allowing the base to use many forms.

For **claim 31, 43,** Andersson teaches a database with the current graphical objects (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the database could receive the current graphical object and that the processing unit could obtain the current graphical object from the database because receiving and sending information from a database is well known in the art.

For **claim 32, 44,** Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). Andersson teaches wherein all object identifiers are stored in the storage unit (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-6). It is obvious that this object identifier would allow the processing unit to locate the current graphical object because the object identifier is a unique identifier; therefore there are a number of well known techniques to locate such an identifier.

For **claim 33,** Andersson teaches a digital unit that is designed to detect position data on a coded base (Andersson, figure 1, item 1). Andersson teaches a processing unit configured to receive detected position data from a digital unit (Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient unit, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor), obtain the rule object upon receipt of the detected position data, and process

said detected position data according to the rule object Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28). The coded base partly being generated from a graphical object (Andersson, figure 1). Andersson teaches a storage unit with a first interface for receiving data and storing graphical objects (Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28) (the recipient unit, such as a computer, is well known to have at least one processor), the graphical objects being characterized by graphic information (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-12), and a second interface for reading the stored graphical objects (Andersson, page 4, lines 27-36);

Andersson does not teach an allocation unit; however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches an allocation unit configured to assign on command, from a position data bank, position data for a current graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26), and to provide allocation data which associates said assigned position data with the current graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Here Russell teaches a base with a bar code reader that can assign position data for the current form (i.e. graphical object) and provide the allocation data for the current form. This can also be from a virtual copy of the form stored in the base. Please note that both Andersson (Figures 10 and 12, for example. Many parts of his disclosure, such as the description of these figures, note of optically readable patterns, i.e. optical parameters) and Russell (Column 8, Lines 1-26 disclose optical marks on a substrate that encode digital information) teach of optically-detectable marks. Please note the combination that teaches to use the base, such as Andersson's structure, with Russell; there is a suggestion in both references of using such a known technique. Russell also teaches wherein the second interface of the storage unit is configured to allow selection of the current graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-

26) (from the barcode reader), wherein the allocation unit is commanded to assign the position data in response to a selection of the current graphical object, and wherein the allocation unit provides said assigned position data to a combining module for application of graphic information corresponding to the current graphical object and said assigned position data to a substrate for forming a coded base (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Here Russell teaches the base is commanded to assign position data when it is made to read a bar code from the selected form and applies the data to the base (i.e. substrate). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson with Russell because both deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Russell would increase the usability of the device by allowing the base to use many forms.

For **claim 34,** Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). Andersson also teaches the current processing unit, when receiving position data, to identify assigned rule object basis of object identifier (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-14).

Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches assigning position data to an object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Russell also teaches printing graphic information and position data (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Russell teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object

(Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67). As for the optically-detectable marks, please note that both Andersson (Figures 10 and 12, for example. Many parts of his disclosure, such as the description of these figures, note of optically readable patterns, i.e. optical parameters) and Russell (Column 8, Lines 1-26 disclose optical marks on a substrate that encode digital information) teach of optically-detectable marks. Please note the combination that teaches to use the base, such as Andersson's structure, with Russell; there is a suggestion in both references of using such a known technique. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson with Russell because both deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Russell would increase the usability of the device by allowing the base to use many forms.

For **claim 35,** Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches assigning position data to an object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26. Russell also teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67). Russell also teaches wherein the rule object connects said at least one measure to at least on position in a local coordinate system which is defined relative to a reference point in the graphic information, and wherein the method further comprises converting said read position data into at least one position in said local coordinate system; and processing the read position data using the rule object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67).

For **claim 36, 37,** Andersson teaches an imagery surface which is divided into groups of positions (regions) where the knowledge of the divisions is used in processing the read position data (Andersson, page 14, lines 23-28).

For **claim 38,** Andersson teaches rule object information that defines a relation to a position data reference point (Andersson, page 5, lines 3-14). Andersson also teaches that this data can be connected to graphic information on a substrate (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30).

For **claim 41, 42,** Andersson teaches using a position code which defines a position area with predetermined subdivision (Andersson, page 5, lines 4-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the subdivision could be of equal size if desired. Andersson teaches detecting a selection of the graphical object among a set of graphical objects pre-stored in the system (Andersson, abstract). Andersson teaches providing all recorded information (Andersson, page 7, lines 3-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the rule object and allocation would be included in the sent data.

Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches assigning position data to an object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26. Russell also teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67). Russell also teaches wherein the rule object connects said at least one measure to at least on position in a local coordinate system which is

defined relative to a reference point in the graphic information, and wherein the method further comprises converting said read position data into at least one position in said local coordinate system; and processing the read position data using the rule object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67). Russell teaches detecting a selection of the graphical object amoung a set of graphical objects pre-stored in the system, the graphical objects characterized by user-readable graphic information configured for application to a substrate (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Russell teaches providing, in the system, position data for each assigned unit, for use in the printing of said one of more position-coded bases (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26); generating allocation data which associates the position data of each assigned unit with the rule object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26); and providing, in the system, said rule object and said allocation data, for use by a processing unit that receives position data detected on said one or more position-coded bases (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Please note that both Andersson (Figures 10 and 12, for example. Many parts of his disclosure, such as the description of these figures, note of optically readable patterns, i.e. optical parameters) and Russell (Column 8, Lines 1-26 disclose optical marks on a substrate that encode digital information) teach of optically-detectable marks. Please note the combination that teaches to use the base, such as Andersson's structure, with Russell; there is a suggestion in both references of using such a known technique. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson with Russell because both deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Russell would increase the usability of the device by allowing the base to use many forms.

For **claim 45,** Andersson teaches detecting a selection of the graphical object among a set of graphical objects pre-stored in the system (Andersson, abstract). Andersson teaches a directing unit to direct the position data to a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33).

Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches assigning position data to an object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26. Russell also teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67). Russell also teaches wherein the rule object connects said at least one measure to at least on position in a local coordinate system which is defined relative to a reference point in the graphic information, and wherein the method further comprises converting said read position data into at least one position in said local coordinate system; and processing the read position data using the rule object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67). Russell teaches detecting a selection of the graphical object among a set of graphical objects pre-stored in the system, the graphical objects characterized by user-readable graphic information configured for application to a substrate (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). Russell teaches providing, in the system, position data for each assigned unit, for use in the printing of said one of more position-coded bases (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26); generating allocation data which associates the position data of each assigned unit with the rule object (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26); and providing, in the system, said rule object and said allocation data, for use by a processing unit that receives position data detected on said one or more position-coded bases (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). As for the optically-detectable marks, please note that both Andersson (Figures 10 and 12, for example. Many parts of his disclosure, such as the description of these figures, note of optically readable patterns, i.e. optical

parameters) and Russell (Column 8, Lines 1-26 disclose optical marks on a substrate that encode digital information) teach of optically-detectable marks. Please note the combination that teaches to use the base, such as Andersson's structure, with Russell; there is a suggestion in both references of using such a known technique. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson with Russell because both deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Russell would increase the usability of the device by allowing the base to use many forms.

For **claim 47,** Andersson teaches storing an association between each object identifier and a network address (Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36, page 5 lines 1-2).

For **claim 48, 49, 50,** Andersson teaches generating an instance identifier to identify the assignment of position data and graphical data (Andersson, page 35, lines 9-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that this could be included in the allocation data because it is another identifier for the same object.

For **claim 51**, Andersson teaches a system for associating position data with graphical objects on a page (Andersson, abstract), the system comprising: a first memory for storing the graphical objects Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28; a second memory containing position data to be assigned to at least some of the graphical objects (Andersson, page 4 lines 27-36; page 6, lines 21-24 and page 14, lines 23-28).

Andersson does not teach an allocation unit; however, in the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches an interface configured to receive a user command selecting from the first memory at least one graphical object to which position data is to be assigned (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26); and a processor configured to assign position data from the second memory to the at least one graphical object, subsequent to the selection by the user (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26). As for the optically-detectable marks, please note that both Andersson (Figures 10 and 12, for example. Many parts of his disclosure, such as the description of these figures, note of optically readable patterns, i.e. optical parameters) and Russell (Column 8, Lines 1-26 disclose optical marks on a substrate that encode digital information) teach of optically-detectable marks. Please note the combination that teaches to use the base, such as Andersson's structure, with Russell; there is a suggestion in both references of using such a known technique. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson with Russell because both deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Russell would increase the usability of the device by allowing the base to use many forms.

For **claim 52**, Russell teaches a subset of the graphical objects stored in the first memory constitute a representation of a page of information, and wherein the interface is configured to permit a user to assign position data to at least part of the page of information (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67).

For **claim 53,** Russell teaches the subset of the graphical objects representing the page of information initially lack position data, and wherein the interface is configured to permit a user

to cause the processor to assign position data to the page of information, wherein the system is further configured to store a link between the page of information and the assigned position data (Russell, column 8, lines 1-26, lines 32-67).

7. **Claims 17, 22, 25, 39, and 46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson J et al. (International Pub# WO 01/48678 A1) Russell et al. (US 6703570 B1) and Sahlberg et al. (US 6958757 B2).

For **claim 17**, Andersson does not teach a browser for selecting graphical objects, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a template server for selecting graphical objects (Sahlberg, figure 1, item 103). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the user to browse the template server to find the template with the graphical object needed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson and Russell with Sahlberg because they all deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Sahlberg would different locations to use the same template.

For **claim 22,** Andersson does not teach a rule object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the rule generator in the storage unit of Andersson. This is obvious because the storage unit is meant

to store data and other data is already being stored in the storage unit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson and Russell with Sahlberg because they all deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Sahlberg would help prevent against miss selection.

For **claim 25,** Andersson does not teach assigning position data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches assigning position data to an object (Sahlberg, column 3, lines 14-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson and Russell with Sahlberg because they all deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Sahlberg would help prevent against miss selection.

For **claim 39,** Andersson teaches the allocation data comprises an address identifier which is associated with a network address of a processing unit (Andersson, page 14, lines 24-33). Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). Andersson does not teach a rule object generator, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches a rule object generator which is designed to generate a rule object from a graphical object (Sahlberg, column 2, lines 18-29 and lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson and Russell with Sahlberg because they all deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Sahlberg would help prevent against miss selection.

For **claim 46,** Andersson teaches allocation data that comprises an object identifier which is associated with the current graphical object (Andersson, figure 1, items 1C-1F, page 16 lines 21-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the object identifier with the position data because both deal with the same object. Andersson does not teach assigning position/allocation data, however, in the same field of endeavor, Sahlberg teaches assigning position/allocation data to an object (Sahlberg, column 3, lines 14-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson and Russell with Sahlberg because they all deal with the same subject matter and the addition of Sahlberg would help prevent against miss selection.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments considered, but are respectfully not persuasive.

Applicant is thanked for the interview to discuss the case with supervisor Awad and examiner Morris and possible claim amendments to overcome the current rejection.

However, it seems to this new examiner, that there is no support for the new limitations. As noted in the 112 section, there is no support for optical detection by the pens as to the location on the coded base. Appropriate correction or clarification is required, thank you.

As for the art rejection, the new amendments do not seem to overcome the current rejection. Please note that both cited references at least suggest of optical recognition means, such as Andersson's Figures 10 and 12 and Russsell notes the bar code can be optical characters. It is important to note the 103 rejection which uses the teachings of both references together. As a result, it seems to examiner that the new limitations do not overcome the current rejection.

Applicant is encouraged to contact the new examiner to discuss the case and any details that might better facilitate how the prosecution of the case has gone so far. As for the art rejection, Applicant is advised to better claim the process in how the touch location fits in with the overall coding. As seen from Applicant's figures, the present invention is much more detailed in this regard than the cited arts and claiming such differences would overcome the current rejection and pass the case to allowance.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendments and non-persuasive arguments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DENNIS P. JOSEPH whose telephone number is (571)270-1459. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on 571-272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DJ

/Amr Awad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629